

REMARKS

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 9, 2008. Claims 14, 27, and 28 are amended. Example support for the amendments is found at ¶ [38] of the application. Claims 14-40 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action includes the following rejections:

- on pages 2-11 of the Action, claims 14-18, 27, 28 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.) and U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0027823 (Rana);
- on pages 11-13 of the Action, claims 19-22, 29 and 35-37 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.) and U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0027823 (Rana) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 (Schloss et al.);
- on pages 13-15 of the Action, claims 23, 24, 26, 38 and 39 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.), U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0027823 (Rana) and U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 (Schloss et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,992 (Mattson); and
- on pages 15-16 of the Action, claims 25 and 40 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 (Tiemann et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 (Tso et al.), U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0027823 (Rana) and U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 (Schloss et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,600 (Smith et al.).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 14-18

Claim 14 is directed to receiving a request for a web page and creating a page object having references to component objects. Claim 14 recites, in part, caching the component object,

the component object cached using a cache key that comprises an identifier that is unique for each occurrence of the component object, the cache key being created when the page object is created.

As discussed during the Interview on March 4, 2009, Tiemann et al. does not disclose caching a component object using a cache key that is unique for each occurrence of the component object. In the Office Action, the Examiner identifies “userid01012001120000.js” as a cache key. Without conceding that “userid01012001120000.js” is a cache key, Tiemann et al. discloses that “userid01012001120000.js” identifies the filename for a static HTML file 170. See column 7, lines 66-67 of Tiemann et al. As shown in Figure 5 of Tiemann et al, static HTML file 170 includes a plurality of static portions, including static portion 311 and static portion 313. Thus, Tiemann et al. discloses an identifier for the entire HTML file but does not disclose a unique cache key for each occurrence of the component object.

Furthermore, Tiemann et al. discloses that the “userid01012001120000.js” identifier is created using a timestamp corresponding to when template 150 was last modified. Thus, the “userid01012001120000.js” identifier is created when template 150 is edited, and not when the page object is created, as required by claim 14. A page object is created at the time of compilation and not at the time of editing.

For at least these reasons, claim 14 is allowable over Tiemann et al. Tso et al. and Rana do not remedy the shortcomings of Tiemann et al. Therefore claim 14 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al. and Rana. Since claims 15-18 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 14, claims 14-18 are also allowable.

Claims 19-26

As discussed, claim 14 is allowable. Neither Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al., Mattson nor Smith et al. remedies the shortcomings of Tiemann et al. Since claims 19-26 depend from claim 14, claims 19-22 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana and Schloss et al., claims 23, 24 and 26 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al. and Mattson and claim 25 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al. and Smith et al.

Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed to a method for providing a response to a request for information from a client computing system to a server computing system having an output cache for storing static portions of web pages. Claim 27 recites, in part, retrieving each of the static components contained in the output cache, wherein each of the static components is cached using a cache key that comprises an identifier that is unique for each occurrence of the static components, the cache key being created when each static component is created. Claim 27 is therefore allowable for reasons similar to those provided above.

In addition, claim 27 recites determining whether any dynamic components correspond to user controls that support output caching.

In contrast, Tiemann et al. makes a distinction between static and dynamic portions of an HTML file by the use of a CACHE tag. See column 6, lines 1-37. Tiemann et al. discloses using the CACHE tag for static portions of the HTML file but does not disclose using the CACHE tag for dynamic portions of the HTML file. Tiemann et al. does not disclose or suggest that dynamic portions of an HTML file are cached at all. Although Tiemann et al. identifies static and dynamic objects, Tiemann et al. does not disclose distinguishing user control objects from other objects. The static elements disclosed in the HTML template in column 6, lines 13-37 are function calls (isblank and is notblank) and are not user controls. Therefore, Tiemann et al. does not disclose or suggest determining whether any dynamic components correspond to user controls that support output caching, as recited in claim 27.

For at least these reasons, claim 27 is allowable over Tiemann et al. Tso et al. and Rana do not remedy the shortcomings of Tiemann et al. Therefore claim 27 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al. and Rana.

Claims 28

Claim 28 recites, in part, obtaining from the cache the page component associated with each user control that supports output caching and that is available at the cache of the server computing device, the page component cached using a cache key that comprises an identifier that is unique for each occurrence of the page component, the cache key being created when the page component is created. Claim 28 is therefore allowable for reasons similar to those provided above.

Further, Claim 28 recites examining the page file at the server computing device to identify whether each of the control references is a user control or a server control and examining each user control at the server computing device to determine whether the user control supports output caching.

Thus, the claim 28 requires that a distinction be made between a user control and a server control and when a control is identified as a user control, a determination is made as to whether the user control supports output caching. Paragraph 51 of the present application identifies a server control as a control that defines code to be executed on the server.

In contrast, Tiemann et al. discloses making a distinction between static and dynamic portions of a template but Tiemann et al. does not disclose making a distinction between a user control and a server control. Therefore, Tiemann et al. does not disclose examining the page file at the server computing device to identify whether each of the control references is a user control or a server control and examining each user control at the server computing device to determine whether the user control supports output caching, as recited in claim 28. Tso et al. and Rana do not remedy the shortcomings of Tiemann et al. Therefore claim 28 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al. and Rana.

Claims 29-40

As discussed above, claim 28 is allowable. None of Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al., Mattson nor Smith et al. remedies the shortcomings of Tiemann et al. Since claims 29-40 depend from claim 28, claims 30-34 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al. and Rana, claims 29 and 35-37 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana and Schloss et al., claims 38 and 39 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al. and Mattson and claim 40 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann et al., Tso et al., Rana, Schloss et al. and Smith et al.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 9, 2009

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471